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# Introduction

**CB: # QoE3\_Configuration\_Report**

**- Check progress from other groups**

**- Discuss the detail information included in QoE configuration and report**

**- How to support per slice QoE measurements?**

**- Prioritization mechanism?**

**- Further discussion on RAN overload handling**

**- TPs if agreeable**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(HW - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-215867](file:///C:\Users\y00239572\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Word\Inbox\R3-215867.zip)

# For the Chairman’s Notes

**For chairlady to copy:**

Detailed discussions

# Discussion [if needed]

Similar as what we did for previous meeting, the discussion will try to discuss the further details on the following topics: activation/deactivation, other configuration details on remaining open issues for slice configuration and reporting, overload handling, RAN visible QoE, radio related measurement&information and other miscellaneous points, the discussion will take the papers from [1] to [26] into account.

Please note that, for other topics which might impact NG, e.g. mobility support, we also have dedicated CB, for which moderator would leave the discussion there.

## Activation and deactivation

Moderator’s note: Since RAN3 received the LS from SA5 about their understanding on the activation and deactivation of QoE measurement, and there is another dedicated CB on activation and deactivation (CB: # QoE2\_Activation\_Deactivation), moderator would suggest we just wait the outcome of that CB and capture the agreement into the TP. Here maybe the only thing is to discuss is if it is enough to include QoE Reference in the Deactivation message.

### QMC Deactivate Message just includes a list of QoE Reference?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other configuration details

### Is there a need to introduce configuration modification procedure for the QMC over NG

This is mentioned in the RAN3 reply LS [25] but not concluded since RAN3 would like to check with SA5, since now RAN3 received LS from SA5 [26], RAN3 should provide an answer, companies are invited to provide your view.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### The QoE reference and MCE IP address are configured per QoE measurement

Moderator’s Note: In order to be precise, here the message structure goes like the following:

1. There is an IE named *UE Application layer measurement configuration List*, including a list of QoE measurements
2. For each QoE measurement in the list, there are IEs including: *QoE reference, Measurement Collection Entity IP Address* and Service Type, where the *QoE reference* is a unique ID.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce a measurement configuration application layer ID over NG

Moderato’s Note: RAN2 agreed to introduce this IE over Uu, here the question is about whether there is a need to copy this IE in the configuration message over NG, other proposals related to this IE are left to the CB on mobility.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Agree that MBS and XR service types are not pursued in Rel-17 NR QoE management.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce the criteria, e.g. time-based, threshold-based or, event-based, for RAN to trigger/stop the QoE measurement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Slice configuration

It was agreed in last meeting to introduce slice info as an explicit IE over NG as part of configuration, the remaining issues are about how slice info is configured over Uu, how to reflect the slice info in reporting, and how to be handled in RAN visible QoE report.

Moderator’s note: 1) for the answers to the questions above, the answer could also be left to RAN2; 2) it is suggested to leave the issue that whether slice info should be included in the reporting container to SA4 (according to the LS, SA4 is considering this issue).

### Whether the slice ID should be configured as an explicit IE to UE over Uu?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether the slice ID is included in the transparent reporting container or not?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to include the slice ID as an explicit IE together with QoE reporting container?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether PDU session(s) information should be included outside of QoE reporting container

Moderator’s Note: This might be overlapped with the CB: # QoE5\_RANVisible, companies could also share view here, moderator’s could coordinate to compose the final conclusion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Handling in case of RAN overload situation

There are many papers to discussion the case of RAN overload situation, including whether there is a need from OAM to configure something, is there a need to configure to the UE, and guidance needed for the UE to resume the reporting, etc.

### Whether to introduce prioritization mechanism of different service types or slices from OAM side, for RAN to consider to release or pause in case of RAN overload situation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether to introduce prioritization mechanism of different service types or slices for the UE to send pending QoE reports after RAN overload is solved

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether a temporary stop and restart of QoE reporting should be indicated to MCE/OAM if such indication was sent to UE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Whether a temporary stop and restart of QoE reporting is applicable to other scenarios in addition to RAN overload

Moderator’s Note: moderator’s understanding is that if the answer is Yes to above question 3.4.3, company could share further comments to this question.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other miscellaneous

Moderator’s note: Anything missing, companies are invited to list below.

### Issue 1

### Issue 2

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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